

# A R E P L Y

TO THE

## BARE-FACED FALSEHOODS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS

OF

### MR. JOHN THEOBALD.

---

BY J. F. BELL.

---

Among the "would be wise," of the present day we may rank Mr. J. Theobald of Ockbrook, Derbyshire. This man, like a second Quixote, full of self confidence, runs full tilt at what he terms "Mormonism," and ignorantly imagines himself well armed and duly trained for the hazardous encounter. But, when the more intelligent and coolheaded of the community take in hand to survey his armour, and observes the style in which he uses it, they are compelled to think far otherwise, and to set him down as a man "having zeal without knowledge," and being more addicted to *rant* than *reason*.

It is not because I consider Mr. Theobald a respectable controversialist, nor from any fear as to the result of his so called refutations of Mormonism, that I take up my pen in reply; but far otherwise, he is neither amiable in his manners, conciliating in his address, decent in his allusions, cogent in his reasoning, nor honest in his imputations; indeed, so deficient is he of these necessary qualifications, that any intelligent and candid person has but to hear him once, to be fully satisfied of the truth of my remarks. Whether we view him as a preacher or controversialist it matters not, the same obtuseness of manners, and vulgarity of expression characterize him in both capacities, and stamp him with a notoriety which I envy not.

He states in the preface of his tract entitled "Mormonism dissected," that he has not been blessed with "a refined education," this he hardly need tell us, for no sensible person would make such a mistake as to suppose he had any at all, unless it be a very bad one. However, it will be as well to give a few specimens of his pious breathings, and elegant phraseology from his own writings, which savour strongly of Billingsgate and Seven Dials.

In his tract, above named, he calls the latter day saints by the following epithets, "latter day infidels," "wildmonsters," "frightful spectres," "raw head and bloody bones," "hobgoblins," "theologesters," "quacks in divinity," "horrible demonized mormon," "poor fungus slaves," "downright knaves," "real dopes," "fungus set of semi darts," "latter day hobgoblins," "adulterers," "poachers," "thieves," "backsliders," "liars," "drunkards," "backsliding renegades," "rotten branches," "maniacs," "semi devils," "men demons," "infernal clan," "heretics," "impostors," and yet he tells us, on the 21st page, that "mormons are not slandered." Pray what does Mr. Theobald designate slander if this is not? He seems to have entirely lost sight of that commandment which says "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." But even supposing for a moment that the mormons, or latter day saints, as a body are as bad as he would represent them, he has nothing whatever to boast of, for according to his own shewing he is of the same stamp. On his 29th page he states that he regards every man in the world as his *brother*, if so he certainly must be brother to those whom he calls "bugbears," "bloody bones," "quacks" and "demons." Very mild brotherly language truly, one need not hesitate as to what sort of a *conversion* he has undergone, if these are the marks of it. Surely the Society to whom he belongs must feel highly honoured, and withal richly blest when they obtain such a man as Mr. Theobald, with such evangelical sentiments, and classic phrases to occupy their pulpits.

He states in his preface that he speaks "just as he feels from his heart." There is not the least doubt of it, for the Holy Spirit never dictated such language to him as he has made use of; but what sort of a heart must Mr. Theobald's be if these are its contents? I certainly must conclude that it is "deceitful above all things, and *desperately wicked*," "for a pure fountain doth not send forth impure water, neither do men gather grapes of thorns, nor figs from thistles." On the same page he says "only let a man speak out, and the devil will also" Now, as Mr. Theobald has, by his torrent of abuse, and barefaced falsehoods, degraded himself below the dignity of a *man*; it follows that he more fitly personates the other party; and surely if his satannic majesty is capable of appreciating a good representative, he is quite prepared to give Mr. Theobald all the credit due for his accurate personification. However, Mr. Theobald seems to be in some measure conscious of his imperfections, and makes an apology, in which he desires "wise men to receive him as a fool." This I have little doubt they will readily comply with; and certainly, if he applies this title to himself, it is quite unnecessary for me to soil my lips, or disgrace my pen, by attaching to him an epithet so opprobrious and offensive. Moreover, he has earned the title so well, that I feel assured no right minded person will for a moment question the validity of his claim.

We will now enter upon the argumentative portions of his tract, in which his folly and ignorance are so conspicuous that the most casual reader would, if possessed of ordinary intelligence, and common candour, at once conclude him to be as destitute of wit, and controversial tact, as he is of learning and politeness.

His first attack is upon the word "Mormon," which he affirms to be Greek, signifying "Bugbear," "False Terror," &c. He states also, that the word "Mormo" is English, having the same meaning, Page 11. Here Mr. Theobald has most grossly committed himself, in stating that which he cannot prove; for the word "Mormon" is not Greek, nor is the word "Mormo" English. If Mr. Theobald will take a second glance at his Lexicon, he will discover that the latter word is Greek, and the one which he mistook for "Mormon" is quite another word; having, in the last syllable the "omega," and not the "omicron," which last mentioned letter is equivalent to our English "O." Had this letter been in the Greek word, instead of the one which really is, (*viz.* omicron-*w*), there might have been some appearance of plausibility. I may state for Mr. Theobald's especial information that the word "Mormon" is neither Greek, nor derived from Greek, but from the "reformed Egyptian." It is a palpable absurdity to confound the one with the other, as much so indeed as to confound *Theobald* with *Theology*.

The next falsehoods in Mr. Theobald's tract are, that "Mormon" is the name by which we "desire to be known;" and, that it is of our "own choosing." Both of these statements I positively deny, and shall consider my *denial* equivalent to his *affirmations* until he brings forth some proof to substantiate them. "Mormon" was the name of a *certain man*, and also of a *particular locality* upon the American Continent; but was never intended to signify a body of people. The name by which we *desire* to be known, and to walk worthy of, is "Saints," and we consider this name far more *Scriptural*, and infinitely more preferable than Papist, Protestant, Dissenter, or even Mr. Theobald's own "Primitive Methodist." But this champion of the Primitives has virtually contradicted himself, for, a few lines further on he intimates that we are "*ashamed*" of the name "Mormon." Now, how does this agree with his previous statement that it was our "*own choosing*?" It is contrary to human nature for men to choose a name they are ashamed of. I must remind him of his own maxim—"Liars should have better memories."

On the same page he is guilty of a most unwarrantable perversion and misapplication of Holy Scripture, in attaching to the Latter Day Saints those peculiar and unenviable marks, which, on his 12th page, he himself states "are applicable to Popery." Now, if St. Paul predicted these things of *Popery*, what authority has Mr. Theobald to impute them to *us*? Certainly none whatever. Were I to act in the same manner, I might retort the compliment, and perhaps more successfully, but this is not my object.

I do not deny that there have been, and still may be, some among us whose character and conduct were anything but commendable: but what of that? Are we to estimate the system by the moral worth of its representative? Certainly not; for such a rule would prove too much, since there are in every system persons of all degrees of morality, and every kind and degree of vice; and, therefore, if each and every system derived its character from its representative, they must be all right and all wrong at the same moment, and subject to unceasing variations.

Were I so disposed, I could point out cases of gross immorality and shocking depravity, which have occurred in the denomination to which Mr. Theobald belongs, which would far

exceed in criminality and licentiousness those which, he says, have occurred among us, but for which, by the bye, he brings no further proof than his own assertion. Were I to imitate his example I might play dreadful havoc with his own character; for, on the 25th of April, while I was addressing an audience in the Cattle Market at Leek, some one bawled out that he knew all Mr. Theobald's "*tricks and manœuvres*;" and, that on one occasion, at least, he (Mr. Theobald) had received a "*good flogging*" while in the army; it was also affirmed that he had done "*everything but murder*."

Now, whether these statements were true or false I neither know nor care; (but my opinion is that there is something rotten in the state of Denmark); I have merely alluded to them for the purpose of shewing upon what slender grounds any one may, like a second Theobald, fabricate rumours, which, while they seriously injure the character of their victim, prove nothing whatever against their religious views.

The Preacher may belie his creed,  
Yet still the Truth preserves its flame;  
The Sage may do a foolish deed,  
Yet Wisdom shares not in his shame.

He states, on the 12th page, that "the Mormon's condemn the Bible as a mere human history," and on the 20th page, that "the rule among the Mormons is to *reject* the Bible, and *substitute a romance* in its stead." Now, we have here sufficient proof that Mr. Theobald is either ignorant of what he was writing about, or that he has wilfully and maliciously lied against the truth. We do not "*condemn*" nor "*reject*" the Bible, nor do we "*substitute a romance in its stead*." In proof of my assertion, I would invite the Reader to our meetings, and solicit his candid perusal of our publications, a few extracts from one of which I will now give, which must certainly brand Mr. Theobald with the infamy of falsehood, "Proving to the world that the *Holy Scriptures are true*." Doctrine and Covenants, section 2, paragraph 2. "And again, the Elders, Priests, and Teachers of this Church shall teach the principles of my Gospel, which are in the *Bible*, and the *Book of Mormon*." Sec. 13, par. 5; see also sec. 13, par. 16.

With regard to his statement that "the system is *based* upon the Book of Mormon, and *derives its name* therefrom," and that "*very few* are in possession of it," I may observe that it is a trine falsehood in no way creditable to its author, Mr. J. Theobald; who seems to have lost sight of every principle of honesty and truth. As he brought forth no proofs to substantiate the statement, I have none to reply to; but, for the information of Mr. Theobald, and all others who entertain similar ideas concerning us, I will state that we are "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." 2 Ephesians 20. And, as I have already shown, our name is not "Mormon" nor "Mormonism," but Latter Day "*Saints*." As to there being few possessors of the Book of Mormon, it may be well to inform Mr. Theobald that there are far more possessors of that Book than he is aware of, so that he in stating what he has, furnishes his readers with still further proof that he knows little or nothing of the matter.\*

He states that Mr. Smith "*was shot by his keeper*," but if he will take the trouble to look at the last page of Messrs. Chambers' Tract, entitled "Religious Impostors," he will perceive a statement materially different. Which, now, are we to believe—Mr. Theobald or Messrs. Chambers? Since they give different statements it is manifest there is a lie between them, and I am inclined to believe, that the onus must once more rest upon the shoulders of the redoubtable Theobald; for, having convicted him of several falsehoods, I have lost all confidence in him as a man of truth.

He ridicules the idea of man being in the *image* of God, or God in the *image* of man. He seems to think that God cannot exist in the image of man without being at the same time full of imperfections, and then forsooth he blames us for his own absurdities. Logical Theobald! Why not bless the world with some evidence of your superiority of intellect, by publishing a new system of ratiocination? Let me ask, have you never read that God made man in his own "*image*" and "*likeness*?" Perhaps you will answer, that "it was in his moral image that God made man;" but let me refer you to the first of Hebrews and the third verse, where we learn that Jesus Christ "is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express *image* of his person." Now if we can find out what sort of *image* the person of Christ was, we shall then know what *shape* or *likeness* the Father is, for the one is the express image of the other. We will now turn to the 2nd Phillipians, 6, 7, 8, verses. The sixth verse says, he is

---

\* The Book of Mormon has gone through two English and two American editions of several thousands each.



"in the form of God," and the 7th and 8th inform us that he "took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of sinful man," and in "*fashion as a man.*" Now it could not have been a moral likeness, or else Christ must have been "*sinful.*" But the Scriptures inform us that he was *without sin.* From these verses we learn that Christ was "in the form of God," and "the likeness of man;" and that this resemblance was not morally but physically. But Mr. John Wesley's 195th hymn, which Mr. Theobald believes in, says, that "God vouchsafed a worm to appear." Now, which are we to believe? The Scriptures inform us that God appeared "as a man," and Mr. Wesley and his followers, of all degrees and classes down to Theobald the Ranter, believe that he appeared as "*a worm,*" or else they don't believe their own Hymn Book. Perhaps they don't believe the Scriptural account, and have, therefore, adopted Wesley's instead. Away, I say, with such grovelling wormy notions of the Deity. It is of no use for Mr. Theobald, or any of his party, to say that the words which I have quoted from J. Wesley's Hymn Book, are figurative, for Wesley himself declares in the preface that he has used "no word but in a *fixed and determinate* sense." Consequently if that is true, it must be their *fixed and determinate* belief that the God they worship is a *Worm!* Such a God I fear not. But Mr. Theobald and his party are quite welcome to all the worms and grubs in creation. Query:—What kind of worm does Wesley mean? Is it the old serpent, the deceiver of our mother Eve?

We will now come to his 15th page, whereon he states that the "relations" of Mr. Smith "*could not believe him upon oath.*" To this I reply, that Mr. Smith could be believed *without an oath*; and his character for truth was such, that his *bare word* would go much farther than the most solemn oath of many. As for the statements of Mr. Theobald, I have already proved them to be so palpably false—that I, for one, should from this time forth hesitate to believe *anything he might say*, even though he might swear it upon "a stock of Bibles as big as Mount Etna," much less if it had no other proof than his bare assertion. As for his propensity for thieving, of which Mr. Theobald makes mention, I denounce it as a fabrication of Mr. Smith's enemies, who, like the enemies of Christ, fearing that their craft was in danger, circulated all kinds of scurrilous reports against his character.

But here is the question, What did Mr. Smith Steal? who from, and when? and last, but not least important, what evidence have we of the fact? "Mr. Theobald says so." But was he a witness? No, then his word has no weight in the case. He may have copied the statement from some tract issued by our enemies, who, like himself were totally ignorant of Mr. Smith, and were entirely dependant upon hearsay and newspaper stories for the filthy matter their tracts contain; but what would any one think of me were I to bring forth such an hotch-potch statement? they would certainly think I was destitute of charity and common sense.

As for the statement of Mr. Smith running away with Emma Hale, I may state that Miss Hale was of age, and so was Mr. Smith, they were therefore capable of contracting marriage with or without the consent of their parents, and when they did so, surely they were at liberty to walk or "run" as they thought fit, without asking the sage advice of Mr. Theobald.

I will now give a few testimonials to the *character* of Mr. Smith and the Latter Day Saints generally, emanating from *qualified and respectable* sources, and which I feel assured will carry with them far more influence and credibility than the foul mouthed slanders of Mr. Theobald, desiring the reader to bear in mind, as he peruses them, that their authors were *not* Latter Day Saints.

J. S. Reed, Esq., in a speech delivered before the Illinois State Convention, in 1844, spoke as follows:—"I do know that his *character* was *irreproachable*; that he was *well known for truth and uprightness*; that he moved in the first circles of community, and he was often spoken of as a young man of intelligence, and *good morals*, and possessing a mind susceptible of the highest attainments." And in speaking of his trial he said:—"Yes Sir, let me say to you, that *not one blemish or spot* was found against his character; he came from that trial, notwithstanding the mighty efforts that were made to convict him of crime by his vigilant persecutors, with his character *unstained by even the appearance of guilt.*"—*Times and Seasons*, Vol. v., p. 549.

With regard to the character of the Saints as a community I will quote a sentence from the appendix to a discourse delivered before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, March 26, 1850, by T. L. Kane, Esq., son of Judge Kane, of Philadelphia. He says,—*"I have been annoyed by comments this hastily written discourse has elicited. Well meaning friends have even invited me to tone down its remarks in favour of the Mormons, for the purpose of securing them a readier acceptance. I can only make them more express. The truth must take care of itself. I not only meant to deny that the Mormons in any wise fall below our own standard of morals, but I would be distinctly understood to ascribe to those of their number with whom I associated in the West, a general correctness of deportment, and purity of character, above the average of ordinary communities."*—p. 85.

The Hon. Truman Smith in the course of a speech which he delivered in the Senate of the United States, July 8th, 1850, after having spoken of the prosperity of the L. D. Saints at G. S. L. Valley, read the following portion of a letter from General John Wilson, dated at Salt Lake City, September 5th, 1849:—

"A more *orderly, earnest, industrious and civil* people I have never been amongst than these, and it is incredible how much they have done here in so short a time. In this city, which contains now, as I believe, about four or five thousand inhabitants, *I have not met in a citizen a single idler*, or any other person who looks like a loafer. The prospects for crops are fair, and there is a *spirit and energy* in all that you see that *cannot be equalled* in any city of any size that I have ever been in, and I will add, not even in Old Connecticut!"—p. 26, Gideon and Co. Printers, Washington.

On his 16th page he has the following impious and unheard of Blasphemy which certainly might be enough to satisfy any one as to the *Conversion* M. T. has undergone:—"What a *mountebank* this Mormon God must be, what a *wandering ghastly hobgoblin* going up and down the universe." If such expressions as these are characteristic of the "*Primitive*" piety of their reckless author, may the Lord in his mercy preserve me from such. But I must conclude on this point as I did on a former one, namely, that as Mr T., to use his own words, "speaks just as he feels from his heart," it is "*desperately wicked*" and redolent of evil thoughts, false accusations, and blasphemy.

On his 19th page he says, "so *convinced* are the Mormon leaders, that they dare not take up the challenge." Convinced of what? as the erudite and scholastic Theobald does not tell us, I suppose I may supply the ellipsis. Be it known then, O, thrasonical Theobald that the "Mormon leaders," as you call them, are "*so convinced*" of your *utter incapability* and *want of courtesy* that they choose rather to let you have plenty of sea room, knowing that you and your money making craft must soon founder without their assistance. You speak of Orson Pratt as the "Liverpool cheat," and his "followers" as "*Mud.*" Do you think now that Mr. Pratt, or any of us, after such uncourtly language would condescend to parley, and cavil with such an unprincipled mortal? No, no, my dear primitive of ranting notoriety, our feelings are too sensitive, and our ideas of propriety and decorum too rigid, to allow of such a thing. We are "*so convinced*" of the fact that your *good word* is *no credit*, and you *bad one* no *disgrace*, that it makes very little difference to us whether you give us the one or the other. We are quite willing indeed that you should continue your raving, so that a discerning and impartial public may judge between us.

He says on his 20th page, that "Mormons call men fools that take the Bible for their guide;" and in order to prove his assertion he makes a garbled quotation from the Book of Mormon, which he says condemns the Bible; after which, by a little clap trap, he endeavours to steal a march upon the good sense and senses of his readers.

The purport of the passage which he quoted from the aforesaid book was *not* that men were fools for believing the Bible, but for maintaining that there was *no need of any more*; but Mr. Theobald by leaving out the word "*more*" makes the quotation read very different.

His next falsehood is, that we "have not any of the order of the Apostles of Christ." Whereas Mr. Clarke, another "Anti-Mormon", says on the first page of his tract, entitled, "Mormonism weighed in the balances and found wanting," that *there is not an ordinance nor an order that was had in the days of the Apostles but what these people have*." The reader will perceive that our enemies differ in their statements concerning us, Mr. Clark says one thing and Mr Theobald another; but which are we to believe? As I have said before, I have caught Mr. Theobald in so many falsehoods and misrepresentations, that I have no confidence in him, and should hesitate to believe him, even should he swear upon a stack of Bibles; I shall therefore accept the statement of Clark in preference.

On the 21st page he says in reference to the Scriptures, "For in them we have eternal life." Now if the reader will turn to the New Testament he will read as follows—"For in then *ye think* ye have eternal life," so that Mr. Theobald has carried his system of garbling into effect, even with the Scriptures, in leaving out two very important words of the sentence (ye think.) Mr. Theobald should follow his own advice in this case, and "sear the Scriptures."

As for the tale about the dead man at Boston, no candid reflecting person would for a moment believe such a thing, destitute of any evidence or data. Perhaps Mr Theobald will tell us *when* it occurred, and who were the parties engaged in the transaction, the name of the person at whose house it occurred, the name of the priests, the name and residence of any of

the bystanders, or in fact any shadow of evidence by which we might arrive at some certainty of the fact. I may state that this tale has been circulated in various forms, in different places, and it is a remarkable fact that such tales as these always point to some place far off, so that no one can tell anything for certain about it.

One version of it was broached in the year 1842, at Boston, on the occasion of a discussion between Elder Adams and Dr. West, when Elder Adams offered to pay all expences if any one of the parties could be brought forth; but Dr. West was unable to do so, or even to give names and dates. If then, it was impossible nine years ago for Dr. West while in the very town (Boston) where the circumstances are said to have occurred, to prove the statement, how utterly futile must be the efforts of Mr Theobald.

On his 26th page he says "if they can discern spirits, why did Joe Smith not discern the mind of his keeper, before he attempted to break out of prison, for which he was shot dead." I answer that his keeper had nothing to do with shooting him, for he himself was overpowered by the mob who came to kill Mr Smith. Mr. Smith had sufficient discernment to know that the mob had murderous intentions, and this was the reason why he attempted to escape. I think Mr Theobald with all his obtuseness of intellect would have a little discernment if he saw a few rifles presented at him. Mr. Smith foresaw his fate sometime before his imprisonment, and spoke of it in the following words:—"I shall die innocent, and it shall yet be said of me"—"*he was murdered in cool blood.*" But why cannot Mr Theobald use proper language and say *Joseph Smith*, instead of "Joe"? There are two reasons, the first is his own, namely, he has "not been blest with a refined education," but "speaks just as he feels from his heart," the second is,—he is deficient of common courtesy and civility.

I have now gone through with Mr Theobald's book of abuse and lies, and shall conclude by observing that so far from hindering the progress of the doctrines we preach, it will only serve to open the eyes of some of his own party, who are, as I have been informed by some of them already disgusted by his conduct, and who consider themselves scandalized by his affinity with them.

---

Farewell friend Theobald, your book of lies  
 Ruins your character among the wise,  
 But just a word or two to you I'll say,  
 Your own dark picture suits you any day.  
 Wise men on thee will look with great contempt,  
 Because for lies you've left sound argument;  
 Thy dread dissecting knives I've keenly viewed,  
 Thy saws and cleaver and thy logic crude;  
 Both tools and workman I find matched for once,  
 The first quite dull, the last a shocking Dunce.



## CAN I NOT BE SAVED WITHOUT BAPTISM?

*Question.*—Can you be saved *with* baptism?

*Answer.*—Yes, I may be saved if I am baptised; for Jesus Christ has said, “*he that believed and is baptised shall be saved.*”

*Q.*—But can you not be saved without believing?

*A.*—“Without *faith* it is impossible to please him;” therefore if I do not please him, how can I expect to be saved by him?

*Q.*—True! but suppose it were *possible* for you to exercise faith in Jesus, and yet neglect to do the things which he and his apostles commanded; would he be pleased with that *neglect* any more than with a want of *faith*?

*A.*—The commandments of Christ are a law to his children; and if I break his commandments, I break the law of God, and that would be sin, for “sin is the transgression of the law; and sin is the thing which God hates.

*Q.*—And is it reasonable to expect that you can be saved by displeasing God?

*A.*—I discover the force of your question, but I am determined to have the truth; and I know that Jesus says, “he that *believeth* and is baptised shall be saved;” but does the scripture anywhere say that he who is not baptised shall be lost?

*Q.*—Has God more than one method of saving sinners?

*A.*—I think not, for that would imply that he was changeable, and had respect to persons, if he would save one, on one condition, and another on other terms.

*Q.*—And did not Christ say to Nicodemus, that “except a man be born of *water* he cannot enter into the kingdom of God”??

*A.*—Yes, but did he not mean *spirit* when he said *water*?

*Q.*—Do you believe that the Bible is true?

*A.*—Most assuredly I do.

*Q.*—Then how can you suppose he meant spirit when he said *water*,—for he said “*of water and of the spirit*,” putting the *water* first, and the *spirit* after; if he meant spirit when he said *water*, he should have said of *water* and of *water*, which would make the bible tell a falsehood as it now stands, and you say the bible is true?

*A.*—Yes, I do,—and I perceive that there would be an inconsistency also in the phrase *spirit and spirit*, although I have always supposed that the *water* meant *spirit* in this place.

*Q.*—Do you not remember that Jesus was baptised of John in *Jordan*, a river of *water*, and that “*to fulfill all righteousness*,” as Christ himself said?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—And that Peter who held the keys of the kingdom of heaven, commanded those who enquired on the day of Pentecost, what they should do to be saved, to be *baptised every one of them for the remission of their sins*?

*A.*—O, Yes!

*Q.*—And that Paul, who had a share in the same ministry, required the people to “be buried with Christ by baptism,” for the answer of a good conscience, as Peter says; and what would be more likely to produce a good or peaceful conscience, than *obedience* to the requirements of the Saviour?

*A.*—True, we read thus, but I had supposed baptism was done away now, and that sprinkling answered the same purpose.

*Q.*—If, in the days of the apostles, God required men to be *buried in*, or *born of the water*, and now will save them without that inconvenience, or by *sprinkling* simply, must he not have changed; and is he not a respecter of persons?

*A.*—To be honest, it does appear so; and I never can believe that God will change the plan of salvation, or respect any man's person; but how is it that Jesus said “these signs shall follow them that believe,—they shall speak with new tongues; cast out devils; heal the sick; take up serpents, &c.” and we see none of these things in these days?

*Q.*—I hope you do not doubt the declaration of Christ, do you?

*A.*—Certainly not, I believe those signs did follow the apostles, just as the scriptures state; but we see none of these things now.

*Q.*—Can it be possible that Christ designed the promise of these things for his apostles only, when he said “them that believe,” addressing himself to his disciples, concerning those who should believe on his testimony, and be baptised by them? Or was the promise to be confined to *that people* only, or *that age*, when Peter said concerning this matter, “this promise

is unto you, and to *your children* and to *all them that are afar off*, even as many as the Lord our God shall call?

A.—No, it cannot.

Q.—Then if you do not doubt Jesus and his apostles, must you not conclude that these signs must have *ceased* to follow the children of men, because *faith* has *ceased* from among them?

A.—These are new ideas to me, I will think of them more; but am I to believe that if men would exercise faith, and attend unto the ordinances of the gospel, as in days of old, these signs would be made visible again upon the earth, or would follow the believer as in days of old?

Q.—Will not the same cause produce the same effect in all ages?

A.—Without doubt it will.

Q.—Why then should not these signs follow those who believe, have faith in God, and keep his commandments, just as they did in the days of Christ?

A.—What! and receive the Holy Ghost too by the laying on of hands?

Q.—If God has not changed, nor the ordinances of his house, nor the plan of salvation, how can you hope to receive the Holy Ghost in any other way than they did in those days, when “on whomsoever they *laid their hands* they received the Holy Ghost?”

A.—But why have I not *heard* and *believed* these things before?

Q.—“How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher; and how shall he preach except he be sent?”

A.—I have heard a great many preachers before, but they never taught me such doctrine.

Q.—Do you not remember that Paul said that *the day of Christ should not come except there came a falling away first*, a falling from the truth and men should be given unto fables?

A.—Yes, and I begin to suspect it has been so, but do you really think that sins are forgiven when men are baptised?

Q.—Does not the scripture say so? did not Peter say “*be baptised every one of you for the remission of your sins*”; and did not Ananias say to Saul, “*Arise and be baptised, and wash away thy Sins*”?

A.—Yes the Bible says so; but it says also “*calling upon the name of the Lord*,” now I have been upon the penitent form, and called upon the name of the Lord, as Ananias commanded, and my sins are forgiven.

C.—Can there be a transgression where there is no law? and you say you never had this law before, therefore you could not sin against it; but should you *now* reject it, how could you get clear of that sin; and where can you find any direction in Scripture to erect *penitent forms*, or to make use of them?

A.—I see your propositions appear quite scriptural.

Q.—Inasmuch as you say you “*see*,” does not your sin remain?

A.—And may I be baptised for the remission of my sins?

Q.—If you believe with all your heart, and are willing to repent of all your sins and forsake them, determined in the strength of the Lord, to keep his commandments to the end, “*thou mayest!*”

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

Book of Mormon, 3s.—

Doctrine and Covenant, 2s. 6d.—

Hymn Book, 1s. 6d.—

Divine Authority, 2d.—

Kingdom of God, Parts 1, 2 and 3, 1d. each; Part, 4 2d.—

Remarkable Visions, 2d.—

Fulfillment of Modern Prophecy, 3d.—

Tracts on the Book of Mormon, Parts, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, 2d. each.—

Absurdities of Immaterialism, 4d.—

Mormonism Triumphant, 4d.—

Great First Cause, 2d.—

Reply to remarks on Mormonism, 2d.—

Millennial Star, a fortnightly periodical. 1d.—

The above may be obtained of Mr. F. D. Richards, 15, Witton Street, Liverpool; Mr. J. Galley, Hurdfield, Macclesfield; Mr. Hargreaves, Bookseller and Stationer, Mill Street, Macclesfield; and Mr. N. Rowan, at W. Wright's, Albion Street, Shelton.